

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Examiner's final Office Action of January 15, 2008 issued with respect to the present application, the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Amendment of the claims and the below Remarks.

### ***Regarding Amendment***

In the Amendment:

independent claims 1 is amended to omit recitation of the base and variant transport keys, and to clarify that the variant authentication key of the second entity is a variant key of a base authentication key included in the at least one other entity and that the first entity is configured to use common signature generation using the transport keys to receive the variant authentication key from the second entity. Support for these amendments can be found in at paragraphs [5470]-[5499] of the present specification;

claims 4-6, 9, 10 and 15 are amended to conform with amended claim 1;

claims 11, 13 and 14 are cancelled;

independent claim 26 is amended similar to independent claim 1;

claims 29, 30, 34 and 36 are amended to conform with amended claim 26;

claim 31 is amended to be properly dependent on amended claim 26;

claim 35 is cancelled; and

claims 7 and 32 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the Amendment does not add any new matter to the present application, nor any new issues to the prosecution of the present application.

### ***Regarding Claim Objections***

It is respectfully submitted that the cancellation of claim 14 and amendment of the dependency of claim 31 provide the corrections required by the Examiner.

### ***Regarding 35 USC 112, first paragraph Rejections***

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the enablement rejections of claims 1 and 26 based on the Amendment which omits the recitations of "variant" and "base" transport keys from the claims.

### ***Regarding 35 USC 112, second paragraph Rejections***

It is respectfully submitted that the amendment of independent claims 1 and 26 to recite that

"the second entity includes at least one variant authentication key configured to be transported from the second entity to the first entity using the transport keys, the variant authentication key being a variant key of a base authentication key included in the at least one other entity and being usable to enable the authenticated communication by the first entity with the at least one other entity",

clarifies that the first, second and at least one other entities are different entities. For example, it is clear that the first entity is device A, the second entity is device B, and the at least one other entity is devices C, D, etc, as described at paragraphs [5470]-[5499] of the present specification.

***Regarding 35 USC 102(b) and 103(a) Rejections***

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claims 1 and 26, and claims 4-7, 9, 15, 29-32 and 34 dependent therefrom, is not disclosed or suggested by any one or more of the Applicant's Admitted Art, Menezes and ISO/IEC 11770-3 either taken alone or in view of Matyas, because none of the cited references teach or suggest transporting a variant authentication key between second and first entities which is a variant key of a base authentication key included in at least one other entity, let alone configuring the first entity to use common signature generation using the transport keys to receive the variant authentication key from the second entity, as is required by the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



---

Kia Silverbrook



---

Paul Lapstun

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762